

KELLER BENVENUTTI KIM LLP
Jane Kim (#298192)
(jkim@kbklp.com)
David A. Taylor (#247433)
(dtaylor@kbklp.com)
Thomas B. Rupp (#278041)
(trupp@kbklp.com)
650 California Street, Suite 1900
San Francisco, CA 94108
Tel: 415 496 6723
Fax: 650 636 9251

Attorneys for Debtors and Reorganized Debtors

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

In re:

PG&E CORPORATION,

- and -

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY,**

Debtors.

- ☐ Affects PG&E Corporation
☐ Affects Pacific Gas and Electric Company
☒ Affects both Debtors

** All papers shall be filed in the Lead Case, No.
19-30088 (DM).*

Bankruptcy Case No. 19-30088 (DM)

Chapter 11

(Lead Case) (Jointly Administered)

**REORGANIZED DEBTORS' OPPOSITION
TO EX PARTE APPLICATION TO
ENLARGE TIME**

[Relates to Docket Nos. 11388 and 11768]

1 PG&E Corporation (“**PG&E Corp.**”) and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (the “**Utility**”), as
2 debtors and reorganized debtors (collectively, the “**Debtors**,” “**PG&E**,” or as reorganized, the
3 “**Reorganized Debtors**”) in the above-captioned chapter 11 cases (the “**Chapter 11 Cases**”),
4 respectfully submit this opposition (the “**Opposition**”) to the *Ex Parte Application to Enlarge Time*
5 [Docket No. 11768] (the “**Application**”) filed by Spiro Jannings (“**Jannings**”). Through the
6 Application, Jannings seeks to vacate the response and hearing dates with respect to the *Reorganized*
7 *Debtors’ Objection to Claim (Claim No. 58462, filed October 17, 2019, of Spiro Jannings)* [Docket
8 No. 11388] (the “**Claim Objection**”).

9 The Reorganized Debtors filed the Claim Objection on October 8, 2021. Jannings’ counsel first
10 approached counsel for the Reorganized Debtors on October 23, 2021, three days before the response
11 deadline on the Claim Objection, to request a continuance of the response deadline, explaining that he
12 had recently been retained as bankruptcy counsel by Jannings.¹ As a courtesy, the Reorganized Debtors
13 agreed to continue the response deadline and hearing date for three months. By agreement of the parties,
14 the response deadline on the Claim Objection is currently January 4, 2022, and the hearing date is
15 January 18, 2022, at 10:00 a.m.

16 Over two months have passed since the parties agreed to the continuance in October. Jannings
17 waited until December 28 to file his *Motion to Dismiss and Abstain* [Docket No. 11753] (the
18 “**Abstention Motion**”). It was only after filing the Abstention Motion that Jannings’ counsel sought a
19 further continuance of the response deadline and hearing date on the Claim Objection. It is not
20 reasonable for Jannings to have waited months while the Claim Objection is pending, only to demand
21 an indefinite continuance of both the response deadline and hearing on the Claim Objection, on an
22 emergency basis, during the week between Christmas and New Year’s, when PG&E personnel and their
23 attorneys are out of the office. Jannings could have brought his Abstention Motion or requested a
24 continuance of the Claim Objection weeks ago,² rather than troubling the Court and PG&E with an

25
26 ¹ The Claim Objection was served on Jannings’ counsel in the state court litigation, who also signed
Jannings’ proof of claim.

27 ² Indeed, Jannings could have brought his Abstention Motion at any time in the past two years since he
28 filed his proof of claim and submitted to the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court.

1 “emergency” the day before New Year’s Eve that is entirely of his own making.³ Having failed to do
2 either, he should not be permitted to bypass his obligation to respond to a Claim Objection that was duly
3 noticed and served nearly three months ago.

4 The Reorganized Debtors reserve all of their rights and arguments with respect to the Abstention
5 Motion, which they will raise at the appropriate time. For now, the Reorganized Debtors believe that it
6 is appropriate to hold Jannings to his agreed-upon response deadline and, to the extent necessary, address
7 the proceedings with respect to the Claim Objection and the Abstention Motion at the initial hearing on
8 the Claim Objection.

9 WHEREFORE, the Reorganized Debtors respectfully request entry of an order (i) denying the
10 Application, and (ii) granting such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and appropriate.

11
12 Dated: December 31, 2021

KELLER BENVENUTTI KIM LLP

13
14 By: /s/ Jane Kim
Jane Kim

15 *Attorneys for Debtors and Reorganized Debtors*
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ³ This delay is particularly unnecessary because the Abstention Motion is unsupported by any new
28 evidence—it relies nearly entirely on the Claim Objection for its relevant facts.